

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

Claims 2, 3, 15 and 29 have each been amended by inserting --, wherein at least one metal oxide compound in the first metal oxide layer is a different compound from a metal oxide compound in the second metal oxide layer, or vice-versa --, as supported by, for example, paragraphs [0038] to [0045] and Example 1, which employs ITO in the first metal oxide layer and IZO in the second metal oxide layer. Note that the above-discussed amendment is not intended to exclude the first and second metal oxide layers having metal oxides in common; as long as at least one particular metal oxide in one layer is not present in the other layer, the claim is satisfied.

No new matter is believed to have been added by the above amendment. Claims 2, 3, 6-11, 13, 15, and 22-31 remain pending in the application.

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during the interview held April 12, 2011, in the above-identified application. During the interview, Applicants' attorney explained the presently-claimed invention and why it is patentable over the applied prior art. The discussion is summarized and expanded upon below.

The rejection of Claims 2-3, 6-11, 13, 15 and 22-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over US 7,030,553 (Winters et al) in view of US 2003/0184688 (Kim), is respectfully traversed.

Applicants maintain all the arguments in traversal of the above rejection made in the previous response, which arguments are hereby incorporated by reference.

In response to these arguments, that Examiner makes a number of findings. In finding (3), the Examiner finds that the claims as written do not state that two different types of metal oxides are used but rather that the crystallinity is different between the two layers.

In reply, and as noted by Applicants' attorney during the above-referenced interview, the claims now require that metal oxide compound(s) in the second metal oxide layer differ(s) from metal oxide compound(s) in the first metal oxide layer. Thus, Applicants' argument that "Kim actually teaches away from the feature of the present invention of using two types of metal oxide layers" is correct.

For all the above reasons, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/591,688  
Reply to Final Office Action of November 19, 2010

All of the presently-pending claims in this application are now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.


Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



---

Harris A. Pitlick  
Registration No. 38,779